

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR
DACTYLOPUSIA NORMAN, 1903. Z.N.(S.) 1517
 (see volume 20, pages 145-147)
 By Per Brinck (Zoological Institute, University, Lund, Sweden)

1. The name *Dactylopodia* Lang (1944) obviously was substituted for *Dactylopusia* Norman (1903), because of the wrong formation of *Dactylopusia* (cf. Code, Appendix D).

2. It is evident that *Cyclops stroemii*, as demonstrated by Lang (1948 : 1363), is a species of family Laophantidae, so Norman (1903 : 368) when designating *Dactylopus stroemii* s. Claus as the type-species of *Dactylopusia* (family Thalestridae) based this designation on a mis-identified species. Claus's *D. stroemii* consists of two species of different genera, belonging to family Diosaccidae.

3. Lang (1944 : 13) on finding that Norman's designation of *C. stroemii* as the type of *Dactylopusia* would cause much confusion, chose *Dactylops thisboides* Claus, a non-committed name of a widespread and common species, as the type-species of *Dactylopodia* (= *Dactylopus*).

4. Vervoort in his application proposes to change Lang's designation of *D. thisboides* as the type-species and to substitute it by *D. vulgaris* Sars, basing his proposal on Sars' interpretation of Baird's *Cyclops stroemii*. Sars' identification of *Cyclops stroemii* with *D. vulgaris* is wrong, however, according to Dr. Lang.

5. Since the Monograph by Lang there have been no nomenclatorial difficulties nor any confusion, the opinion in the Monograph being generally accepted.

6. Therefore, there seems to be no reason to change the well-founded proposal in Lang's *Monographie der Harpacticiden*, a widely used monograph which will for a long time be the standard work on the group in question.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF *BORIOMYIA* BANKS,
 1905. Z.N.(S.) 1531
 (see volume 20, pages 305-306, volume 21, page 91)
 By Ellis G. MacLeod (Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.)

This contemplated action raises two critical points of general importance which I should like to direct your attention to:

(1) In his paragraph 6, Mr. Kimmins has argued 'Dr. B. Tjeder, in particular, has adhered to the use of the name *Boriomyia* Banks (*sensu* 1905) and he has recently pointed out (1961, *S. Afr. Anim. Life* 8 : 366) that if a new name be needed for *Boriomyia* Banks, 1905, the generic name *Wesmaelius* Krüger, 1922, as a subjective synonym of *Boriomyia* Banks, 1905, should replace *Kimmisia* Killington, 1937.' Mr. Tjeder's statement (*op. cit.*) on this point reads as follows: 'Unfortunately Dr. Killington did not know that the name *Wesmaelius* Krüger (1922) is available if *Boriomyia* Banks (1905) cannot be used, but introduced a new name *Kimmisia*.'

Both of these statements leave the distinct impression that Dr. Killington erred in 1937 by proposing *Kimmisia* to replace Banks' invalid name of 1905 rather than utilizing Krüger's generic name *Wesmaelius* for the taxon. It should be pointed out, however, that Killington did not adopt Krüger's name for the reason that he did not consider the type species of *Wesmaelius* Krüger (*Hemerobius concinnus* Stephens, 1836, by original designation) to be congeneric with the species which had been known by the invalid name of *Boriomyia* Banks, 1905 and, accordingly, provided a valid name for the taxon.

While there are undoubtedly Neuropterists who will agree with the subjective synonymy of *Wesmaelius* Krüger and *Kimmisia* Killington, there are others who certainly do not, this divergence of views stemming, of course, from the fact that this involves a question of zoological interpretation and not of nomenclatorial debate. The possible disappearance of *Kimmisia* Killington as a junior subjective synonym of *Wesmaelius* Krüger is, in my view, simply not germane to the nomenclatorial question

of how best to achieve stability and universality. The Rules are certainly not to be set aside whenever a name is menaced by subjective synonymy with an older name.

(2) It is Mr. Kimmin's contention in paragraphs 6 and 7 of his application that the ends of stability and universality would be best served by a validation of the name *Boriomyia* Banks, 1905 (thus eliminating *Kimminisia* Killington as a junior subjective synonym) because of the frequent use of *Boriomyia* Banks, 1905 to cover the species of *Kimminisia* in the years since 1937, principally by Mr. Tjeder. I believe that this point is also in need of clarification.

Mr. Tjeder has, indeed, published numerous taxonomic studies on these insects in which he has used *Boriomyia* Banks (*sensu* 1905). His original reasons for this action (1941, *Ent. Tid.* 62 : 27-28) involved the mistaken notion that there were insufficient differences between *Kimminisia* Killington and *Boriomyia* Banks, 1904 (*nec* 1905) and on this basis his action, while not correct, is, nevertheless, justifiable. Later, however, after I had given him specimens of the type species of *Boriomyia* Banks, 1904 for study, while he readily admitted the generic distinctness of these two groups, he still (1961, *op. cit.*) refused to adopt the name *Kimminisia* Killington, stating that he preferred to utilize Banks' invalid name of 1905 because this was the usage which Banks had intended.

While the number and quality of Mr. Tjeder's papers devoted to these insects which have appeared since 1937 is indeed impressive, Mr. Kimmins does not make it clear that these are not the only publications which have dealt with these insects since the appearance of Killington's name in 1937. In a total of at least fifteen papers published by ten different Neuropterists during this period the name *Kimminisia* Killington has been utilized in preference to *Boriomyia* Banks, 1905. These works have included revisions of the Hemerobiidae of North America (Carpenter, 1940, *Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci.* 74 (7) : 193-280) and of Madagascar (Fraser, 1951, *Nat. Malgache* 3 (1) : 15-31), the Neuroptera fascicle for Bronn's *Klassen und Ordnungen des Tierreichs* (Freidrich, 1953) and a generic synopsis of the Hemerobiidae of the world (Nakahara, 1960, *Mushi* 34 (1) : 1-67). Although several papers by other authors have appeared which have followed Mr. Tjeder's nomenclatorial treatment of these names, *Boriomyia* Banks, 1905 has, nevertheless, been used by fewer authors and in fewer total publications than has *Kimminisia* Killington.

Under these circumstances I fail to see how a validation of *Boriomyia* Banks, 1905 can contribute anything toward stability or universality since it would replace a name, which, in addition to having been valid, has also been the more frequently used. More importantly, it would, in effect, penalize those authors who have followed the Rules and would seem to argue for the principle that the continued usage of an invalid name in itself constitutes grounds for the eventual acceptance of the name.

For these reasons I feel that Mr. Kimmins' proposal should not be adopted.

By D. E. Kimmins (British Museum (Natural History), London)

My object in submitting this application was primarily to get a ruling from the International Commission one way or the other, though naturally I would prefer a decision in favour of *Boriomyia* Banks, 1905.

I do not dispute the objections put forward in these two letters [by Carpenter and MacLeod] (there would have been no reason for submitting my case if there were not points on both sides). I merely wished to do justice to Banks, who has been rather badly treated by the strict application of the Rules.

By W. Eglin (Basel, Switzerland)

Ich unterstütze voll und ganz den Antrag meines Britischen Kollegen, da ich selber—wie auch mein leider verstorberner Lehrer—Herr. Prof. Dr. Ed. Handschin—den Gattungsbegriff *Boriomyia* Banks immer als den im Jahre 1905 gegebenen akzeptiert und respektiert habe, da Banks selber es war, der sich so korrigiert hat.

Die Anerkennung der Diagnose und des Genotypus von 1905 bringt endlich Klarheit in diese Gruppe der Hemerobiiden. Denn kaum hatte Killington in seinen British Neuroptera diesen Namen *Boriomyia* verworfen und durch die beiden Namen